| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 10/062,970 | JONES ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Leigh C. Maier | 1623 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | <u>.</u> |
| (1) <u>Leigh C. Maier</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Tom Anderton</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 17 December 2004 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: 112, 2nd | | |
| Claims discussed: 21 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: none | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet | | |
| Part III. | | · |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant | /Applicant's Representative Sig | gnature – if appropriate) |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon further review of the specification and non-patent literature, it was determined that the original form of the claim would be fully understood by one of ordinary skill and would be the most appropriate nomenclature. Mr Anderton approved the examiner's amendment to change the claim to the original form.